

# The Supercooling of a Nematic Liquid Crystal

P. De\*

Department of Physics  
University of Rhode Island  
Kingston, RI 02881

Robert A. Pelcovits,  
Department of Physics,  
Brown University  
Providence, RI 02912

E. Vogel and J. Vogel  
Institut für Theoretische Physik,  
R.W.T.H. Aachen  
Templergraben 55  
W-5100 Aachen, Germany

February 1, 2008

# Abstract

We investigate the supercooling of a nematic liquid crystal using fluctuating non-linear hydrodynamic equations. The Martin-Siggia-Rose formalism is used to calculate renormalized transport coefficients to one-loop order. Similar theories for isotropic liquids have shown substantial increases of the viscosities as the liquid is supercooled or compressed due to feedback from the density fluctuations which are freezing. We find similar results here for the longitudinal and various shear viscosities of the nematic. However, the two viscosities associated with the nematic director motion do not grow in any dramatic way; i.e. there is no apparent freezing of the director modes within this hydrodynamic formalism. Instead a glassy state of the nematic may arise from a “random anisotropy” coupling of the director to the frozen density.

## 1 Introduction

The study of a supercooled nematic liquid crystal and the possible formation of a nematic glass<sup>1</sup> is potentially richer than corresponding studies of supercooled simple fluids. The presence of anisotropy in the nematic liquid due to the overall alignment of the molecular long axes introduces orientational degrees of freedom into the description of the system and yields a model similar to a spin glass with translational degrees of freedom coupled to the spin fluctuations. We use the term “nematic glass” to describe a liquid crystal where both the translational (density) and orientational (director) fluctuations are frozen. Assuming that we supercool the liquid starting from its nematic phase (rather than the isotropic phase) we expect a nematic glass to have long-range orientational order and thus be similar to a mixed magnetic phase where both ferromagnetic and spin glass order coexist.<sup>2</sup> The presence of both translational (density) and orientational (director) fluctuations and their coupling leads to a novel glass-forming system.<sup>3</sup> Glass formation in this system could potentially occur in a two-stage process where the density or director modes freeze first, followed by the other, or in a process where both freeze simultaneously.

In recent years a theoretical approach to the study of glass formation has been developed using either mode-coupling calculations<sup>4</sup> or fluctuating

nonlinear hydrodynamics.<sup>5</sup> These approaches were initiated by Leutheusser<sup>4</sup> who showed that a model of a dense fluid obtained from kinetic theory exhibits a sharp glass transition where the system becomes nonergodic. Das, Mazenko, Ramaswamy and Toner<sup>5</sup> developed an equivalent model on the basis of fluctuating nonlinear dynamics. Subsequently, Das and Mazenko<sup>6</sup> discovered a nonhydrodynamic mechanism which cuts off the sharp transition, leading to a rounded transition. These authors claim that the cutoff is due to the proper mathematical treatment of the relationship  $\vec{P} = \rho \vec{V}$  where  $\vec{P}$  is the momentum density,  $\rho$  is the mass density, and  $\vec{V}$  is the velocity field. The physical origin of this cutoff is unknown. More recently, Schmitz et al.<sup>7</sup> have argued that the calculation of Das and Mazenko is not correct. Furthermore, they claim that the perturbative calculations of refs. 5 and 6 do not properly account for detailed balance. Restoring detailed balance to the perturbation theory apparently restores ergodicity and leads to a rounded transition. However, Das and Mazenko and Schmitz et al. all agree that the original Leutheusser theory as well as its hydrodynamic version with no cutoff mechanism are a good approximation to the more complete theories of refs. 6 and 7 in describing the growth of the viscosities in the pre-glass transition regime. Eventually the growth of the viscosities is limited by one of these cutoff mechanisms. Comparison of these theories with experiments yields some encouraging agreement,<sup>8</sup> though this agreement is by no means complete, especially at very low frequencies.

In this paper we study the formation of a nematic glass using fluctuating nonlinear hydrodynamics. We will limit our attention primarily to the pre-glass transition regime in light of the discussion above, and we will not concern ourselves with the question of detailed balance or the Das Mazenko cutoff mechanism. The primary advantage of the fluctuating hydrodynamic theory is that new slow variables (such as the director modes or variables associated with broken translational symmetries<sup>9</sup>) are readily incorporated. As described in detail in the next section, we supplement the nonlinear hydrodynamics equations used by Das et al. to study simple fluids, with two equations describing the dynamics of the director in a compressible nematic. The full set of equations we employ also includes a nonlinear coupling  $(\hat{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \rho)^2$  between the density and director  $\hat{n}$ . Density fluctuations couple to some, but not all of the nematic viscosities through this coupling. The Leutheusser feedback mechanism then leads to the enhancement of these viscosities with a universal prediction for their power law behavior. However, there is appar-

ently no director feedback mechanism within this formalism, and we find no evidence for the freezing of the director modes. Nevertheless, it is tempting to speculate that the term  $(\hat{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \delta \rho)^2$  in the free energy leads to freezing of the director. Once the density has frozen, or almost frozen this term will mimic a random anisotropy field in an amorphous magnet.<sup>10</sup> The frozen density gradients  $\vec{\nabla} \rho$  play the role of the quenched random axis. This model is believed to exhibit a spin-glass phase, which would correspond in our case to frozen director modes, with no nematic long range order in an infinite system. However, for a finite sized system, there would be apparent long-range order, especially if the coefficient of the biquadratic term is small. Whether this proposed freezing of the director takes place immediately upon freezing of the density or requires further supercooling is unclear and beyond the scope of our present theoretical treatment.

This paper is organized as follows: in the next section we formulate the nonlinear hydrodynamic equations for a compressible nematic including the above-mentioned nonlinear coupling of density and director modes. In section III we use the Martin-Siggia-Rose formalism to study the effects of the nonlinearities on the bare transport coefficients. Finally in section IV we discuss the implications of our calculations for the growth of the viscosities and the mode structure as the nematic is supercooled. Various technical details appear in the appendix.

## 2 Non-Linear Hydrodynamic Equations

In contrast to the spherical molecules of simple liquids, the molecules of liquid crystals are elongated in shape.<sup>11</sup> Intermolecular interactions cause the anisotropic molecules to align along a preferred direction denoted by the director vector  $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ . Fluctuations in the director can extend over macroscopic distances and decay over finite times, leading to new hydrodynamic modes in addition to the shear and sound wave modes of a simple liquid. The broken rotational symmetry also permits more viscosities: in a compressible nematic liquid crystal, there are six independent viscosities.<sup>12</sup> The linear equations for the hydrodynamic modes of a liquid crystal have been known for almost twenty years.<sup>13</sup> A systematic method for deriving the nonlinear contributions is to write them in the form of generalized Langevin

equations:<sup>14</sup>

$$\partial\psi_i/\partial t = \bar{V}_i[\psi] - \sum_j \int d^3x' \Gamma_{ij}(\mathbf{x}') \cdot \frac{\delta H}{\delta\psi_j(\mathbf{x}')} + \Theta_i, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\psi_i(\mathbf{x}, t)$  represents one of the seven possible hydrodynamic fields: the mass density  $\rho(\mathbf{x}, t)$ , three components of the momentum density  $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ , the energy density  $e(\mathbf{x}, t)$  and two components of the fixed-length director  $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ . The label  $i$  in this equation denotes the type of field, as well as the vector index on  $\vec{P}$  and  $\vec{n}$ .  $\bar{V}_i[\psi]$  represents the reversible part of the dynamic equations and is given by:

$$\bar{V}_i[\psi(\mathbf{x})] = \sum_j \int d^3x' \{\psi_i(\mathbf{x}), \psi_j(\mathbf{x}')\} \frac{\delta H}{\delta\psi_j(\mathbf{x}')} \quad (2.2)$$

and  $H$  is the energy obtained by integrating the free energy density  $F[\psi]$ :

$$H = \int d^3x F[\psi(\mathbf{x})]. \quad (2.3)$$

The Poisson bracket in eqn. (2.2) is defined in its usual manner as:

$$\{\psi_i, \psi_j\} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta, k} \left[ \frac{\delta\psi_i}{\delta r_k^{\alpha\beta}} \frac{\delta\psi_j}{\delta P_k^{\alpha\beta}} - \frac{\delta\psi_i}{\delta P_k^{\alpha\beta}} \frac{\delta\psi_j}{\delta r_k^{\alpha\beta}} \right] \quad (2.4)$$

where  $r_k^{\alpha\beta}$  is the  $k^{th}$  component of the vector  $\mathbf{r}^{\alpha\beta}$  which points to the  $\beta^{th}$  atom of the  $\alpha^{th}$  molecule of the liquid crystal. The second term on the right hand side of the equation of motion (2.1) represents the dissipative contributions in form of the dissipative matrix  $\Gamma_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ . Finally,  $\Theta_i(\mathbf{x}, t)$  denotes a Gaussian noise source which satisfies:

$$\langle \Theta_i(\mathbf{x}, t) \Theta_j(\mathbf{x}', t') \rangle = 2k_B T \Gamma_{ij}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') \delta(t - t'). \quad (2.5)$$

It has been argued that the dominant transport anomalies at the glass transition in a simple liquid are due to the slow decay of density fluctuations, and the effects of energy fluctuations can be ignored.<sup>4,5</sup> We shall denote the global preferred direction of orientation by  $\mathbf{n}_0 = \mathbf{e}_z$ . Local fluctuations in orientation are specified by  $\delta\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{n}_0$  where we restrict  $\delta\mathbf{n} = (\delta n_x, \delta n_y, 0)$  to linear order in  $\delta n_i$ .<sup>15</sup> Then  $\mathbf{n}$  satisfies  $\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 1$  up to order  $(\delta\mathbf{n})^2$ . Furthermore one can assume that the wave vector  $\mathbf{k}$  of a disturbance lies in the  $x - z$

plane. This allows us to treat  $\delta n_x$  and  $\delta n_y$  as longitudinal and transverse fluctuations with respect to  $\mathbf{k}$  respectively.<sup>16</sup> Our set of dynamical variables  $\psi_i$  then includes the density, three components of the momentum, and the director fluctuations,  $n_x$  and  $n_y$ , which are respectively equal to  $\delta n_x$ , and  $\delta n_y$  in the present approximation.

In order to evaluate the Poisson bracket between the six dynamical variables  $\rho, P_x, P_y, P_z, n_x$  and  $n_y$  we need a microscopic description for each variable. We define:

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} m^\beta \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{r}^{\alpha\beta}(t)), \quad (2.6)$$

$$P_i(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} P_i^{\alpha\beta}(t) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{r}^{\alpha\beta}(t)), \quad (2.7)$$

$$n_i(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\alpha} n_i^{\alpha}(t) \delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{R}^{\alpha}}. \quad (2.8)$$

We model an elongated molecule with two atoms only:  $\mathbf{R}^{\alpha}$  is the center of mass of the  $\alpha^{th}$  nematic molecule and  $n_i^{\alpha} = r_i^{\alpha} / |\mathbf{r}^{\alpha}|$ , and  $\mathbf{r}^{\alpha}$  is the relative vector between the atoms, which, we shall assume, model an elongated molecule of mass  $m^{\alpha}$ . The variable  $\beta$  in  $\mathbf{r}^{\alpha\beta}$  takes on values 1 or 2, and  $\mathbf{r}^{\alpha} = \mathbf{r}^{\alpha 1} - \mathbf{r}^{\alpha 2}$  while  $\mathbf{R}^{\alpha} = (\mathbf{r}^{\alpha 1} + \mathbf{r}^{\alpha 2})/2$ .

With the definitions (2.5) – (2.8), the Poisson brackets required in (2.2) and defined in (2.4) can be computed in a straightforward manner with the following results:

$$\{\varrho(\mathbf{x}), P_j(\mathbf{x}')\} = \nabla_j(\varrho(\mathbf{x})\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')); \quad (2.9)$$

$$\{P_i(\mathbf{x}), P_j(\mathbf{x}')\} = -\nabla_j(\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')P_i(\mathbf{x})) + \nabla'_i(\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')P_j(\mathbf{x}')); \quad (2.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{P_i(\mathbf{x}), n_j(\mathbf{x}')\} &= [(\lambda + 1)\delta_{ij}n_k(\mathbf{x}')/2 + (\lambda - 1)\delta_{kj}n_i(\mathbf{x}')/2 - \lambda(n_i n_j n_k)(\mathbf{x}')] \cdot \\ &\quad \nabla_k[\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')] + \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')(\nabla'_i n_j(\mathbf{x}')). \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where  $\nabla_i \equiv \partial/\partial x_i$  and  $\nabla'_i \equiv \partial/\partial x'_i$  etc. In writing eqn. (2.10) we have introduced the “form factor”  $\lambda$  which is related to the shape of the molecules and equals unity only in the limit of infinitesimally thin molecules.<sup>17</sup> All other Poisson brackets are zero.

The final step in evaluating  $\bar{V}_i[\psi]$  is to calculate  $\delta H/\delta\psi_j$ . Expressing the free energy density  $F(\rho, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{n})$  as a sum of kinetic and potential energies, we rewrite (2.3) as:

$$H = \int d^3x (\varepsilon_k + \varepsilon_u^\rho + \varepsilon_u^n + \varepsilon_u^c) \quad (2.12)$$

where  $\varepsilon_k$  is the kinetic energy density of the molecules,  $\varepsilon_u^\rho$  is the potential energy density due to density fluctuations and  $\varepsilon_u^n$  is that due to the director fluctuations. Finally  $\varepsilon_u^c$  is an energy density due to the coupling of density and director fluctuations. For the kinetic energy density we have:

$$\varepsilon_k(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{\mathbf{P}^2(\mathbf{x}, t)}{2\rho(\mathbf{x}, t)}, \quad (2.13)$$

For the potential energy density of the density fluctuations we choose the simplest form incorporating  $\vec{\nabla}\rho$ :

$$\varepsilon_u^\rho(\vec{x}, t) = \frac{A}{2}(\delta\rho(\vec{x}, t))^2 + \frac{B}{2}(\vec{\nabla}\rho(\vec{x}, t))^2 \quad (2.14)$$

where A and B are phenomenological constants, and  $\delta\rho = \rho(\vec{x}, t) - \rho_0$  with  $\rho_0$  being the uniform density. The gradient term in (2.14) is rotationally isotropic which is unrealistic in an anisotropic system like the nematic. We will incorporate the effects of anisotropy below in  $\varepsilon_u^c$ , the coupling of  $\vec{\nabla}\rho$  to  $\hat{n}$

The simplest choice for  $\varepsilon_u^n$  is:

$$\varepsilon_u^n(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{2}K(\nabla_i n_j(\mathbf{x}, t))(\nabla_i n_j(\mathbf{x}, t)) \quad (2.15)$$

where  $K$  is a Frank elastic constant and repeated indices are summed over. In general, the symmetry of a nematic allows for three independent elastic constants<sup>11</sup> corresponding to the distortions splay, twist and bend. We have made the simplification of setting the three elastic constants equal to  $K$ . While this equality is broken upon renormalization (see Section III), the difference between the elastic constants is not large and we will ignore it.

Finally in  $\varepsilon_u^c$  we incorporate the expected anisotropy in density fluctuations and choose,

$$\varepsilon_u^c(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{2}I(\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla\rho(\mathbf{x}, t))^2, \quad (2.16)$$

where  $I$  is a phenomenological coupling constant. In general one might introduce a coupling of the form  $\frac{I}{2}(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\rho)^2 + \frac{I'}{2}(\vec{n} \times \vec{\nabla}\rho)^2$  to account for the expected anisotropy in the density fluctuations, i.e. the energy of such fluctuations should depend on the relative orientation of the director and the wavevector of the fluctuation. However, because of the following vector identity:

$$(\vec{\nabla}\rho)^2 = (\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\rho)^2 + (\vec{n} \times \vec{\nabla}\rho)^2 \quad (2.17)$$

we can eliminate the coupling proportional to  $I'$  in favor of a redefinition of  $I$  and the inclusion of the last term in (2.14). This choice simplifies our perturbation theory in section III, and allows  $I$  to be negative. However rodlike molecules will probably be characterized by positive values of  $I$  since the director will prefer to align perpendicular to the wavevector of the density field. We can think of (2.14) and (2.16) together as providing a simple model for the static structure factor of the nematic, where density correlations are not isotropic in space but depend on the local director orientation. The effect of local structure on a simple fluid as it is supercooled was considered by Das.<sup>18</sup>

Using (2.9) - (2.17) we can evaluate the reversible terms in (2.1). For the  $\vec{P}$  equation of motion we can express the result conveniently in terms of the divergence of a reactive stress tensor, i.e.

$$\bar{V}_{\vec{P}i} = - \sum_j \nabla_j \sigma_{ij}^{P,R}, \quad i, j = x, y, z \quad (2.18)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{ij}^{P,R} = & \frac{P_i P_j}{\rho} + \delta_{ij} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \chi^{-1} (\delta\rho)^2 + \frac{1}{2} K (\nabla_k n_\ell)^2 \right. \\ & + \rho I \nabla_k (n_k (\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\rho)) + \frac{I}{2} (\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\rho)^2 \Big] \\ & + I (\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\rho) n_j \nabla_i \rho + K (\nabla_i n_\ell) (\nabla_j n_\ell) \\ & - \sum_k \mu_{ijk} (-K \nabla^2 n_k + J (\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\rho) \nabla_k \rho) \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

and

$$\mu_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + 1)n_j \delta_{ik} + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda - 1)n_i \delta_{jk} - \lambda n_i n_j n_k \quad (2.20)$$

The stress tensor appearing in (2.18) is not symmetric. However, the equation of motion for  $\vec{P}$  is not sensitive to this asymmetry. A symmetric choice for  $\sigma_{ij}^R$



would yield the same forces as well as guaranteeing conservation of angular momentum<sup>12</sup> which is not an issue in our analysis.

The reversible part of the director equation of motion is given by,

$$\bar{V}_{n_i} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\vec{P} \cdot \vec{\nabla} n_i + (\vec{\Omega} \times \vec{n})_i + \lambda \sum_{k=x,y,z} (n_k \delta_{ij} - n_j n_j n_k) A_{kj} \quad i = x, y \quad (2.21)$$

where

$$A_{kj} = \frac{1}{2\rho}(\nabla_k P_j + \nabla_j P_k) \quad (2.22)$$

and,

$$\vec{\Omega} = \frac{1}{2\rho}(\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{P}) \quad (2.23)$$

A dissipative stress tensor can be introduced to write the dissipative contribution to (2.1). The dissipative momentum stress tensor  $\sigma_{ij}^{P,D}$  is defined via the relation,

$$\sum_{j=x,y,z} \nabla_j \sigma_{ij}^{P,D} = \sum_{j=x,y,z} \Gamma_{PiPj} \frac{\delta H}{\delta P_j} \quad i = x, y, z \quad (2.24)$$

The uniaxial symmetry of the nematic dictates that  $\sigma_{ij}^{P,D}$  has the following form,<sup>13</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} -\sigma_{ij}^{P,D} = & 2(\nu_1^0 + \nu_2^0 - 2\nu_3^0)n_k n_m A_{mk} n_i n_j + 2(\nu_3^0 - \nu_2^0)(n_i n_k A_{kj} + n_l n_k A_{ik}) \\ & + (\nu_5^0 - \nu_4^0 + \nu_2^0)(n_i n_j A_{kk} + \delta_{ij} n_k n_m A_{km}) + 2\nu_2^0 A_{ij} + (\nu_4^0 - \nu_2^0) A_{kk} \delta_{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

The five bare viscosity coefficients  $\nu_1^0, \nu_2^0, \nu_3^0, \nu_4^0$ , and  $\nu_5^0$  are in general not equal to each other. If  $\nu_1^0 = \nu_2^0 = \nu_3^0 = \nu_4^0 - \nu_5^0$  we recover the usual form for the dissipative stress tensor of a simple fluid. If the nematic is incompressible then all terms in  $\sigma_{ij}^{P,D}$  which are proportional to  $A_{kk}$  must vanish, implying that  $\nu_2^0 = \nu_4^0$  and  $\nu_5^0 = 0$ , and three independent viscosities remain. As we are interested in density fluctuations we will work with the full tensor displayed in (2.25). Comparing (2.24) and (2.25) we can identify the nonzero elements of the viscosity matrix  $\Gamma_{PiPj}$ :

$$\Gamma_{P_x P_x} = -(\nu_4^0 + \nu_2^0) \nabla_x^2 - \nu_3^0 \nabla_z^2, \quad (2.26)$$

$$\Gamma_{P_y P_y} = -\nu_2^0 \nabla_x^2 - \nu_3^0 \nabla_z^2, \quad (2.27)$$

$$\Gamma_{P_z P_z} = -\nu_3^0 \nabla_x^2 - (2\nu_1^0 + \nu_2^0 - \nu_4^0 + 2\nu_5^0) \nabla_z^2, \quad (2.28)$$

$$\Gamma_{P_x P_z} = -(\nu_5^0 + \nu_3^0) \nabla_x \nabla_z. \quad (2.29)$$

All other elements of the viscosity matrix  $\Gamma_{P_i P_j} = 0$ . If we go the limit of a simple fluid ( $\nu_1^0 = \nu_2^0 = \nu_3^0 = \nu_4^0 - \nu_5^0$ ), then  $\Gamma_{P_i P_j}$  reduces to the tensor  $L_{ij}$ , used in refs. 5 and 18.

The dissipative contribution to the director equation is proportional to the “molecular field”,  $\delta H / \delta n_i$ , with the proportionality constant conventionally written as  $1/\gamma_1^0$ , where  $\gamma_1^0$  has the units of viscosity. Thus we identify,

$$\Gamma_{n_i n_j} = \frac{1}{\gamma_1^0} \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = x, y \quad (2.30)$$

All other elements of the viscosity matrix  $\Gamma_{ij}$  are zero. In particular all off-diagonal elements  $\Gamma_{n_i P_j}$  can be shown to be zero on the basis of time-reversal symmetry.<sup>12</sup>

The compressible nematic is thus characterized by six hydrodynamic fields and six independent viscosities:  $\nu_1^0, \nu_2^0, \nu_3^0, \nu_4^0, \nu_5^0$  and  $\gamma_1^0$ . Another viscosity  $\gamma_2$  commonly discussed in the literature which describes the torque exerted on the director by a shear flow is related to  $\gamma_1$  via  $\gamma_2 = -\lambda \gamma_1^0$  where  $\lambda$  is the reactive coefficient introduced in eqn. (2.11).

Our final nonlinear hydrodynamic equations for the compressible nematic are as follows:

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{P} = 0 \quad (2.31)$$

$$\frac{\partial P_i}{\partial t} = - \sum_{j=x,y,z} \nabla_j \sigma_{ij}^P, \quad i = x, y, z \quad (2.32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial n_i}{\partial t} = & \vec{\Omega} \times \vec{n})_i - \frac{1}{\rho} (\vec{P} \cdot \vec{\nabla}) n_i \\ & + \lambda \sum_{k,\ell=x,y,z} A_{k\ell} n_k (\delta_{i\ell} - n_i n_\ell) \\ & + \frac{K}{\gamma_1^0} \nabla^2 n_i - \frac{I}{\gamma_1^0} (\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \rho) \nabla_i \rho, \quad i = x, y \end{aligned} \quad (2.33)$$

where

$$\sigma_{ij}^P = \sigma_{ij}^{P,R} + \sigma_{ij}^{P,D} \quad (2.34)$$

with  $\sigma_{ij}^{P,R}$  and  $\sigma_{ij}^{P,D}$  given by (2.19) and (2.25) respectively.

### 3 Transport coefficients

To investigate the effects of the nonlinearities in the equations of motion (2.31) – (2.34) on the transport properties of the nematic we use the Martin-Siggia-Rose (MSR) formalism.<sup>19</sup> This formalism allows us to calculate the correlation functions  $G_{ij}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{x}', t') \equiv \langle \delta\psi_i(\vec{x}, t) \delta\psi_j(\vec{x}', t') \rangle$  where  $\psi_i$  represents any of our six hydrodynamic fields and the brackets refer to the average over the noise source  $\Theta_i$  defined in (2.5). It will also enable us to calculate response functions, and obtain corrections to the bare viscosities introduced in the previous section. We refer the reader to refs. 6 and 19 for full details on the MSR method; we summarize the essential ideas here.

We define a generating function  $Z_U[\psi, \hat{\psi}]$  as follows:

$$Z_U[\psi, \hat{\psi}] = C \int D(\psi) D(\hat{\psi}) \exp(-A_U[\psi, \hat{\psi}]) \exp \int d\mathbf{x} dt U_i(\mathbf{x}, t) \psi_i(\mathbf{x}, t). \quad (3.1)$$

where  $C$  is a constant and  $\psi$  collectively represents the six hydrodynamic fields  $\psi_i$ . Functional differentiation of  $Z_U$  with respect to  $U$  generates the correlation functions  $G_{ij}$ :

$$G_{ij}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{x}', t') = \frac{\delta^2 \ln Z_U}{\delta U_i(\vec{x}, t) \delta U_j(\vec{x}', t')} \quad (3.2)$$

The six auxiliary fields  $\hat{\psi}$  were introduced to exponentiate each of the six hydrodynamic equations of motion (2.1). The integration over the noise source  $\Theta_i$  has been replaced by an integration over the fields  $\psi_i$ . The action  $A_U$  is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} A_U[\psi, \hat{\psi}] = & \int d\vec{x} d\mathbf{t} d\vec{x}' dt \hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) \beta^{-1} \Gamma_{ij}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{x}', t') \hat{\psi}_j(\mathbf{x}'; t) \\ & + i \int d\mathbf{x} dt \hat{\psi}_j(\mathbf{x}, t) \left[ \frac{\partial \psi_j(\mathbf{x})}{\partial t} - \bar{H}_j[\psi] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\bar{H}_j$  is defined by:

$$\bar{H}_j[\psi] = \bar{V}_j[\psi] - \sum_j \int d\mathbf{x}' dt' \Gamma_{ij}(\mathbf{x}' t') \frac{\delta H}{\delta \psi_j(\mathbf{x}', t')} \quad (3.4)$$

Introducing the "vector"  $\phi = (\rho, \mathbf{P}, n_x, n_y, \hat{\rho}, \hat{\mathbf{P}}, \hat{n}_x, \hat{n}_y)$ , we can then rewrite

$A_U[\psi, \hat{\psi}] \equiv A_U[\phi]$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_U[\phi] = & \frac{1}{2} \int d1 d2 \sum_{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha(1) G_0^{-1}(1, 2) \phi_\beta(2) \\
& + \sum_{N=3\dots} \frac{1}{N} \int d1 d2 \dots dN \sum_{\underbrace{\alpha\beta\gamma\dots}_N} V_{\alpha\beta\gamma\dots}^N \underbrace{\phi_\alpha(1) \phi_\beta(2) \phi_\gamma(3) \dots}_N
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Here the integration variables  $1, 2, 3, \dots$  stand for  $(\mathbf{x}, t)$ . The explicit expressions  $G_0^{-1}$  for the vertices  $V_{\alpha\beta\gamma\dots}$  will be presented later. The action  $A_U$  generates the full non-linear hydrodynamic equations for a nematic liquid. When we omit the vertices what remains then is a pure quadratic Gaussian field theory. The corresponding  $A_U$  contains the inverse of the linearized correlation matrix  $G_0^{-1}$  and thus generates the linearized hydrodynamic equations of a nematic liquid. We first discuss this limit before doing perturbation theory in the vertices.

The linearized theory, as well as the perturbation theory, are most easily discussed in Fourier space. We Fourier transform (3.5) in space and time recalling our discussion following (2.5) where we assumed that the wavevector  $\vec{k}$  lies in the  $x - y$  plane. The matrix  $G_0^{-1}(\vec{k}\omega)$  is displayed in Table I where we have introduced the following tensors for notational convenience:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{ij} = & \delta_{ij} \frac{K}{2} (\lambda + 1) k_z \\
& + \delta_{ix} \delta_{jz} \frac{K}{2} (\lambda - 1) k_x
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{ij}^0 = & \delta_{ij} \delta_{jx} \Gamma_{xx}^0 + \delta_{iy} \delta_{jy} \Gamma_{yy}^0 \\
& + \delta_{iz} \delta_{jz} \Gamma_{zz}^0 + (\delta_{ix} \delta_{jz} + \delta_{iz} \delta_{jx}) \Gamma_{xz}^0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where  $\Gamma_{xx}^0, \Gamma_{yy}^0, \Gamma_{zz}^0$  and  $\Gamma_{xz}^0$  are the Fourier transforms of the viscosity matrix elements (2.26) – (2.29) respectively.

The inversion of  $G_0^{-1}$  is most easily accomplished by decomposing  $\vec{P}$  and  $\vec{n}$  into longitudinal and transverse components. The calculation is straightforward though tedious especially for the longitudinal portion. The elements of the matrix  $G_0$  provide the physical correlation and response functions for

the linearized theory. Correlation functions of any two hatted variables are identically zero. Correlation functions of unhatted variables can be found to leading order in  $k^2$  from the corresponding response functions via the fluctuation-dissipation theorems:

$$\langle \rho \rho \rangle = -2\beta^{-1} \chi \text{Im} \langle \rho \hat{\rho} \rangle \quad (3.8)$$

$$\langle n_x n_x \rangle = -2\beta^{-1} \chi_n \text{Im} \langle n_x \hat{n}_x \rangle \quad (3.9)$$

$$\langle n_y n_y \rangle = -2\beta^{-1} \chi_n \text{Im} \langle n_y \hat{n}_y \rangle \quad (3.10)$$

where  $\chi$  is the static density structure factor given by  $(A + Bq^2)^{-1}$  and  $\chi_n$  is the static director structure factor given by  $(Kk^2)^{-1}$ . We could also write corresponding relations for the momentum correlation functions, however, they are not needed in elucidating the mode structure and calculating the corrections to the transport coefficients.

The density and director response functions in the linearized theory are given by the following expressions:

$$\langle \delta \rho(\vec{k}, \omega) \delta \hat{\rho}(-\vec{k}, -\omega) \rangle^o = \frac{\omega \rho_o + ik^2 \Gamma_o}{\rho_o(\omega^2 - c_o^2 k^2) + i\omega k^2 \Gamma_o} \quad (3.11)$$

$$\langle \delta n_x(\vec{k}, \omega) \delta \hat{n}_x(-\vec{k}, -\omega) \rangle^o = \frac{\omega \rho_o + ik^2 \nu_L^o}{\rho_o(\omega + ik^2 \tilde{\Gamma}_s^o)(\omega + ik^2 \tilde{\Gamma}_f^o)} \quad (3.12)$$

$$\langle \delta n_y(\vec{k}, \omega) \delta n_y(-\vec{k}, -\omega) \rangle^o = \frac{\omega \rho_o + ik^2 \nu_T^o}{\rho_o(\omega + ik^2 \Gamma_s^o)(\omega + ik^2 \Gamma_f^o)} \quad (3.13)$$

The results are correct up to terms of relative order  $k^2$ . The viscosities appearing in (3.11)–(3.13) are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_o &= -(\nu_1^o + \nu_2^o - 2\nu_3^o) \sin^2(2\theta)/2 \\ &\quad + (\nu_2^o + \nu_4^o) \sin^2 \theta \\ &\quad + (2\nu_1^o + 2\nu_5^o + \nu_2^o - \nu_4^o) \cos^2 \theta \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

$$\nu_L^o = \nu_3^o \cos^2(2\theta) + (\nu_1^o + \nu_2^o) \sin^2(2\theta)/2 \quad (3.15)$$

$$\nu_T^o = \nu_2^o \sin^2 \theta + \nu_3^o \cos^2 \theta \quad (3.16)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Gamma}_{s,f}^o &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\nu_L^o}{\rho_o} + \frac{K}{\gamma_1} \right) \pm \\ &\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left( \frac{\nu_L^o}{\rho_o} + \frac{K}{\gamma_1} \right)^2 - \left( (1 + \lambda \cos 2\theta)^2 \frac{K}{\rho_o} + \frac{4K\nu_L^o}{\rho_o\gamma_1} \right)}\end{aligned}\quad (3.17)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{s,f}^o &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\tilde{\Gamma}_b}{\rho_o} + \frac{K}{\gamma_1} \right) \pm \\ &\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left( \frac{\tilde{\Gamma}_b}{\rho_o} + \frac{K}{\gamma_1} \right)^2 - \left( (\lambda + 1)^2 \frac{K}{\rho_o} \cos^2 \theta + \frac{4K\tilde{\Gamma}_b}{\rho_o\gamma_1} \right)}\end{aligned}\quad (3.18)$$

where  $\theta$  is the angle between  $\vec{k}$  and the z axis.

In writing (3.17) and (3.18) we have assumed that the director modes appearing in (3.12) and (3.13) are diffusive rather than propagating. This is true for equilibrated nematics<sup>13</sup> where the orientational relaxation time of the director  $(Kk^2/\gamma_1)^{-1}$  is small compared to the shear diffusion times  $(\nu_L^o k^2/\rho_o)^{-1}$  and  $(\nu_T^o k^2/\rho_o)^{-1}$ . We shall see subsequently that this does not remain true when the nematic is supercooled or compressed rapidly, and propagating shear modes can appear. In the absence of supercooling (3.17) and (3.18) can be approximated as follows:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_f^o \approx \nu_L^o/\rho_o \quad (3.19)$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_s^o \approx \Gamma_s^o \approx K/\gamma_1 \quad (3.20)$$

$$\Gamma_f^o \approx \nu_T^o/\rho_o \quad (3.21)$$

Thus there are two “slow” modes with viscosities  $\Gamma_s^o$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}_s^o$  corresponding to the slow relaxation of director fluctuations, while the fast modes with viscosities  $\Gamma_f$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}_f$  are like ordinary shear waves. In addition to these four modes we also have two sound modes appearing in (3.11) with speed  $c_o$  and damping  $\Gamma_o$ .

We now calculate the corrections to the linearized theory due to the vertex  $V^N$  appearing in (3.5). If we perform the rescalings  $\psi \rightarrow \beta^{+1/2}\psi$  and  $\hat{\psi} \rightarrow \beta^{-1/2}\hat{\psi}$  we see that the quadratic part of  $A_U$  is  $0((k_B T)^o)$ , and the higher-order terms proportional to  $V^N$  are of order  $(k_B T)^{(N/2)-1}$ . Thus we

can systematically compute corrections to the linearized theory in powers of  $k_B T$ . In particular one-loop diagrams will be  $0(k_B T)$ .

The inverse of the correlation matrix for the complete nonlinear theory satisfies the formal equation:

$$G^{-1}(1, 2) = G_o^{-1}(1, 2) - \Sigma(1, 2) \quad (3.22)$$

which defines the self-energy  $\Sigma$ . We can then write corresponding equations for the renormalized transport coefficients by referring to Table I. As shown in ref. 6 the renormalized viscosities are most readily obtained by looking at the renormalization of the terms in the action which are quadratic in the hatted fields. Thus the elements of the viscosity matrix  $\Gamma_{ij}$  renormalize as follows:

$$\Gamma_{xx}^{\vec{k}, \omega} = \Gamma_{xx}^o + \frac{\beta}{2} \Sigma_{\hat{P}_x \hat{P}_x}(\vec{k}, \omega) \quad (3.23)$$

$$\Gamma_{yy}(\vec{k}, \omega) = \Gamma_{yy}^o + \frac{\beta}{2} \Sigma_{\hat{P}_y \hat{P}_y}(\vec{k}, \omega) \quad (3.24)$$

$$\Gamma_{zz}(\vec{k}, \omega) = \Gamma_{zz}^o + \frac{\beta}{2} \Sigma_{\hat{P}_z \hat{P}_z}(\vec{k}, \omega) \quad (3.25)$$

$$\Gamma_{xz}(\vec{k}, \omega) = \Gamma_{xz}^o + \frac{\beta}{2} \Sigma_{\hat{P}_x \hat{P}_z}(\vec{k}, \omega) \quad (3.26)$$

$$1/\gamma_1(\vec{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\gamma_1^o} + \frac{\beta}{2} \Sigma_{\hat{n}_x \hat{n}_x}(\vec{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\gamma_1^o} + \frac{\beta}{2} \Sigma_{\hat{n}_y \hat{n}_y}(\vec{k}, \omega) \quad (3.27)$$

Referring to Table I we find that  $K/\gamma_1$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $C$  renormalize as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{K}{\gamma_1} &= \left( \frac{K}{\gamma_1^o} \right) + \frac{i}{k^2} \Sigma_{n_x \hat{n}_x}(\vec{k}, \omega) \\ &= \left( \frac{K}{\gamma_1} \right)_o + \frac{i}{k^2} \Sigma_{n_y \hat{n}_y}(\vec{k}, \omega) \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

$$\lambda = \lambda_o - \frac{2}{k_2} \Sigma_{\hat{n}_y P_y}(\vec{k}, \omega) \quad (3.29)$$

$$c^2 = c_o^2 + \frac{1}{k_z} \Sigma_{\hat{P}_x \rho} \quad (3.30)$$

The uniaxial symmetry of the nematic as well as conservation of momentum allows us to write momenta self-energies as follows, (cF. (2.26)–(2.29)):

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x\hat{P}_x}(\vec{k},\omega) = & -k_x^2(\gamma_2(\vec{k},\omega) + \gamma_4(\vec{k},\omega)) \\ & -k_z^2\gamma_3(\vec{k},\omega)\end{aligned}\quad (3.31)$$

$$\Sigma_{\hat{P}_y\hat{P}_y}(\vec{k},\omega) = -k_x^2\gamma_2(\vec{k},\omega) - k_z^2\gamma_3(\vec{k},\omega) \quad (3.32)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{\hat{P}_z\hat{P}_z}(\vec{k},\omega) = & -k_x^2\gamma_3(\vec{k},\omega) \\ & -k_z^2[2\gamma_1(\vec{k},\omega) + \gamma_2(\vec{k},\omega) \\ & -\gamma_4(\vec{k},\omega) + 2\gamma_5(\vec{k},\omega)]\end{aligned}\quad (3.33)$$

$$\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x\hat{P}_z}(\vec{k},\omega) = -k_z k_x(\gamma_3(\vec{k},\omega) + \gamma_5(\vec{k},\omega)) \quad (3.34)$$

where the functions  $\gamma_i(\vec{k},\omega)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 5$  renormalize the viscosities  $\nu_i$  as follows:

$$\nu_i(\vec{k},\omega) = \nu_i^o + \frac{\beta}{2}\gamma_i(\vec{k},\omega), i = 1, \dots, 5 \quad (3.35)$$

In the hydrodynamic limit the response functions will have the same form as in the linearized theory with the bare transport coefficients replaced by their renormalized values which depend on  $\vec{k}$  and  $\omega$ . As discussed in the Introduction we are ignoring any possible nonhydrodynamic terms which might cutoff a sharp transition and focus instead on the behavior of the renormalized viscosities. Eqns. (3.14) – (3.18) will then be valid for the renormalized quantities and we have the following relations for the generalized transport coefficients appearing in the response functions:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(\vec{k},\omega) = \Gamma^o - \beta \left[ \frac{k_x^2}{k^4}\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x\hat{P}_x}(\vec{k},\omega) + \frac{k_z^2}{k^4}\Sigma_{\hat{P}_z\hat{P}_z}(\vec{k},\omega) \right. \\ \left. + 2\frac{k_x k_z}{k^4}\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x\hat{P}_z}(\vec{k},\omega) \right]\end{aligned}\quad (3.36)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_L(\vec{k},\omega) = \nu_L^o - \beta \left[ \frac{k_z^2}{k^4}\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x\hat{P}_x}(\vec{k},\omega) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{k_x^2}{k^4}\Sigma_{\hat{P}_z\hat{P}_z}(\vec{k},\omega) - \frac{2k_x k_z}{k^4}\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x\hat{P}_z}(\vec{k},\omega) \right]\end{aligned}\quad (3.37)$$



$$\nu_T(\vec{k}, \omega) = \nu_T^o - \beta \left( \frac{1}{k^2} \right) \Sigma_{\hat{P}_y \hat{P}_y}(\vec{k}, \omega) \quad (3.38)$$

Using (3.32) – (3.35) we see that these renormalized viscosities are well behaved in the limit  $\vec{k} \rightarrow 0$ .

The preceding discussion indicates that we need to calculate the following self-energies in order to obtain the renormalized transport coefficients:  $\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x \hat{P}_x}, \Sigma_{\hat{P}_y \hat{P}_y}, \Sigma_{\hat{P}_z \hat{P}_z}, \Sigma_{\hat{P}_x \hat{P}_z}, \Sigma_{\hat{n}_x \hat{n}_x}, \Sigma_{n_x \hat{n}_x}, \Sigma_{\hat{n}_y P_y}$ , and  $\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x \rho}$ . We have done so to one-loop order under the following condition: we keep only those diagrams where there is a possibility of feedback from either density or director fluctuations. Thus we consider diagrams where the propagators are either  $G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}, \omega)$  or  $G_{n_i n_j}(\vec{k}, \omega), i, j = x, y$ . (In the Appendix we show that mixed propagators cannot yield a feedback). The diagrams will be bubble-type and contain two three-point vertices. The symmetrized three-point vertices in the action (3.5) that contribute to the diagrams within our approximation are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = & \frac{1}{2} \left[ \tilde{V}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(1, 2, 3) + \tilde{V}_{\beta\alpha\gamma}(2, 1, 3) \right. \\ & + \tilde{V}_{\gamma\beta\alpha}(3, 2, 1) + \tilde{V}_{\alpha\gamma\beta}(1, 3, 2) \\ & \left. + \tilde{V}_{\beta\gamma\alpha}(2, 3, 1) + \tilde{V}_{\gamma\alpha\beta}(3, 1, 2, ) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

where

$$\tilde{V}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(1, 2, 3) = \sum_{i=1}^{11} \tilde{V}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^{(i)}(1, 2, 3) \quad (3.40)$$

and the  $\tilde{V}^{(i)}$  are given in Fourier space by,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{(1)}(1, 2, 3) = & \frac{i}{2} \sum_{ij} \delta_{\alpha\hat{P}_i} \delta_{\beta\rho} \delta_{\gamma\rho} i \cdot \\ & [A\delta_{ij}(k_2 + k_3)_j + B((k_2 + k_3)_j k_{3i} k_{3j} \\ & - (k_2 + k_3)_i k_{2j} k_{3j})] \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4 \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

$$\tilde{V}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{(2)}(1, 2, 3) = iK \sum_{jl} \delta_{\alpha\hat{P}_j} \delta_{\beta n_l} \delta_{\gamma n_l} (i)^3 k_{2j} k_3^2 \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4 \quad (3.42)$$

$$\tilde{V}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{(3)}(1, 2, 3) = \frac{i}{2} (\lambda + 1) K \sum_{jl} \delta_{\alpha\hat{P}_j} \delta_{\beta n_l} \delta_{\gamma n_j} (i)^3 (k_{2l} + k_{3l}) k_3^2 \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4 \quad (3.43)$$

$$\tilde{V}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{(4)}(1, 2, 3) = \frac{i}{2}(\lambda - 1)K \sum_{jl} \delta_{\alpha\hat{p}_j} \delta_{\beta n_j} \delta_{\gamma n_l} (i)^3 (k_{2l} + k_{3l}) k_3^2 \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4 \quad (3.44)$$

$$\tilde{V}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{(5)}(1, 2, 3) = -i\lambda K \sum_j \delta_{\alpha\hat{p}_z} \delta_{\beta n_j} \delta_{\gamma n_j} (i)^3 (k_{2z} + k_{3z}) k_3^2 \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4 \quad (3.45)$$

$$\tilde{V}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{(6)}(1, 2, 3) = -iI \sum_j \delta_{\alpha\hat{p}_j} \delta_{\beta\rho} \delta_{\gamma\rho} (i)^3 (k_{3j} k_{3z}^2) \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4 \quad (3.46)$$

$$\tilde{V}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{(7)}(1, 2, 3) = -i\frac{I}{2}(\lambda + 1) \sum_j \delta_{\alpha\hat{p}_j} \delta_{\beta\rho} \delta_{\gamma\rho} (i)^3 (k_{2j} k_{3z}) (k_{2z} + k_{3z}) \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4 \quad (3.47)$$

$$\tilde{V}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{(8)}(1, 2, 3) = -i\frac{I}{2}(\lambda - 1) \sum_j \delta_{\alpha\hat{p}_z} \delta_{\beta\rho} \delta_{\gamma\rho} (i)^3 (k_{2j} k_{3z}) (k_{2j} + k_{3j}) \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4 \quad (3.48)$$

$$\tilde{V}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{(9)}(1, 2, 3) = -iI\rho^0 \sum_j \delta_{\alpha\hat{p}_j} \delta_{\beta n_x} \delta_{\gamma\rho} (i)^3 (k_{2j} + k_{3j}) \cdot ((k_{2x} + k_{3x}) k_{3z} + (k_{2z} + k_{3z}) k_{3x}) \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4 \quad (3.49)$$

$$\tilde{V}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{(10)}(1, 2, 3) = i\lambda I \delta_{\alpha\hat{p}_z} \delta_{\beta\rho} \delta_{\gamma\rho} (i)^3 (k_{2z} + k_{3z}) k_{2z} k_{3z} \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4. \quad (3.50)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^{11}(1, 2, 3) &= -i\frac{I}{\gamma_1} \sum_{\ell} \delta_{\alpha\hat{n}_{\ell}} \delta_{\beta\rho} \delta_{\gamma\rho} (i)^2 \\ &\quad k_{2\ell} k_{3z} \delta(1 + 2 + 3) (2\pi)^4 \end{aligned} \quad (3.51)$$

where  $\delta(1 + 2 + 3) \equiv \delta(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \vec{k}_3)$ . The three-point vertices appearing in (3.42) – (3.51) arise from the reactive momentum stress tensor (2.19) excluding the convective term  $(P_i P_j / \rho)$ . The vertex (3.52) arises from the dissipative part of the director equation; as we shall see it ultimately plays no role in the growth of the viscosities.

Using these vertices we have evaluated the relevant self-energies. The results are quite complex and are tabulated in the Appendix. The renormalized transport coefficients have the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\vec{k}, \omega) &= \Gamma_o + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^\infty dt e^{i\omega t} \int \frac{d\vec{k}'}{(2\pi)^3} \\ &\quad \times [G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}', t) G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', t) (\chi^{-2} + f_o(\vec{k}, \vec{k}'))] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k}', t)G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', t)K^2 f_1(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') \\
& +G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k}', t)G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', t)K^2 f_2(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') \\
& +G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}', t)G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', t)I^2 f_3(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') \quad (3.52)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_L(\vec{k}, \omega) = & \nu_L^o + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^\infty dt e^{i\omega t} \int \frac{d\vec{k}'}{(2\pi)^3} \\
& \times \left[ G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}', t)G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', t)K^2 g_1(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') \right. \\
& \left. + G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k}', t)G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', t)K^2 g_2(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') \right] \quad (3.53)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_T(\vec{k}, \omega) = & \nu_T^o + \frac{\beta}{2} K^2 k_x^2 \int_0^\infty dt e^{i\omega t} \\
& \int \frac{d\vec{k}'}{(2\pi)^3} \left[ h_1(\vec{k}, \vec{k}')G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k}', t) \right. \\
& \left. \times G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', t) + h_2 G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}', t)G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', t) \right] \quad (3.54)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}, t)$ ,  $G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k}, t)$ ,  $G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k}, t)$  are the correlation functions of the density and director modes respectively as functions of  $\vec{k}$  and  $t$ . They can be found by inverse Laplace transforming the response functions. The momentum-dependent functions  $f_o, f_1, f_2, f_3, g_o, g, g_2, h_1$  and  $h_2$  are discussed in the Appendix ; their precise form is not necessary here. However, we do note that their angular dependence implies that all of the viscosities  $\nu_i, i = 1, \dots, 5$  are subject to density and director feedback. On the other hand, there is no feedback for  $c, \lambda$ , and most importantly  $K/\gamma_1$ . As we shall see in the next section, this latter result is important in eliminating the possibility of director freezing.

## 4 Implications for Supercooling

We now consider the implications of our results from the previous section for the supercooling of a nematic liquid crystal. Our analysis follows Leutheusser's original approach to the density feedback mechanism, except we are also interested in a potential director feedback mechanism, and the behavior of the six viscosity coefficients.

We begin by recalling Leutheusser's argument for the freezing of the density fluctuations in a simple fluid. The density response function (3.11) can be rewritten as,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_1(\vec{k}, \omega) &\equiv \langle \delta\rho(\vec{k}, \omega) \delta\hat{\rho}(-\vec{k}, -\vec{\omega}) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega - \frac{\rho k^2 c^2}{\omega\rho + ik^2\Gamma}}\end{aligned}\quad (4.1)$$

If the viscosity  $\Gamma$  grows as the fluid is supercooled (or compressed), then (4.1) indicates that

$$\Phi_1(k, \omega) \sim \frac{1}{\omega + i\rho c^2/\Gamma}, \Gamma \rightarrow \infty \quad (4.2)$$

This form indicates that the liquid is freezing, in particular as  $\Gamma \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\Phi_1$  develops a pole at  $\omega = 0$ . In deriving (4.2) we assumed that  $\Gamma$  was growing very large. Leutheusser showed that this will in fact occur via a feedback mechanism that couples density fluctuations to  $\Gamma$ , specifically the result (3.53), (dropping the terms proportional to  $G_{nn}$  for the moment). The correlation function  $G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}, t)$  is given by the inverse Laplace transform of  $\Phi_1$  multiplied by  $\chi$ . Thus, ignoring the  $\vec{k}$  dependence, (3.53) yields an equation of the form,

$$\Gamma(\omega) = \Gamma^o + \lambda \int_0^\infty dt e^{i\omega t} \Phi_1^2(t) \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\Phi_1(t)$  is the inverse Laplace transform of  $\Phi_1(\omega)$ . Equations (4.2) and (4.4) can be solved to yield a glass transition where  $\Phi_1(\omega) \sim 1/\omega$ ,  $G_{\rho\rho}(t) \rightarrow$  nonzero constant, as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\Gamma(\omega = 0)$  diverges. In particular  $\Gamma(\omega = 0)$  diverges as,

$$\Gamma(\omega = 0) \sim (T - T_G)^\mu \quad (4.4)$$

where  $\mu \approx 1.8$  and  $T_G$  is the glass transition temperature.

As discussed in the Introduction it is now believed that (4.2) is not correct and should be replaced by,

$$\Phi_1(\vec{k}, \omega) \sim \frac{1}{\omega + i\rho c^2/\Gamma + i\gamma} \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\gamma$  does not go to zero as the fluid is supercooled. The origin of  $\gamma$  is still a subject of debate.<sup>6,7</sup> Its presence will cutoff the Leutheusser transition and (4.4) will not be true asymptotically. Nevertheless, it is believed that

there will be a substantial growth in the viscosity as the fluid is supercooled which is eventually rounded off.

We now proceed with a Leutheusser style analysis for the nematic, bearing the preceding discussion in mind about the limits of such an analysis. We first examine the longitudinal director response function given in (3.12)

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_2(\vec{k}, \omega) &\equiv \langle \delta n_x(\vec{k}, \omega) \delta \vec{n}_x(-\vec{k}, -\omega) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega + \frac{ik^2\omega \frac{K\rho_o}{\gamma_1} - k^4(\nu_L \frac{K}{\gamma_1} + \frac{1}{4}(1+\lambda \cos 2\theta)^2 K)}{\omega\rho_o + ik^2\nu_L L}}\end{aligned}\quad (4.6)$$

where we have used (3.17). Equation (3.54) indicates that  $\nu_L$  does incorporate density feedback (through the product  $G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}', t)G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}-\vec{k}', t)$ ) and hence it will grow as the nematic is supercooled. Eqn. (4.6) reduces then in the large  $\nu_L$  limit to:

$$\Phi_2(\vec{k}, \omega) \sim \frac{1}{\omega + ik^2 K/\gamma_1}, \quad \nu_L \rightarrow \infty \quad (4.7)$$

In the Appendix we show that  $K/\gamma_1$  does not renormalize in any dramatic way and is not affected by the density or possible director feedback mechanism. Experimentally,  $K/\gamma_1$  has been measured in supercooled nematics<sup>20</sup> and found to be consistent with  $K/\gamma_1 \sim e^{-1/T}$ . Thus, as the temperature is reduced, the director mode will slow down but there will be no sharp transition a *la* Leutheusser or even a rounded one. The viscosity  $\nu_L$  will grow and appear to diverge due to the density fluctuations as will  $\nu_T$ . The absence of a freezing transition for the director modes is true even if the director modes are propagating rather than diffusive. In the limit of large  $\nu_L$ , (4.7) is still obtained even if  $\tilde{\Gamma}_s$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}_f$  in (3.17) become complex (which implies that there are damped, propagating modes). Thus to study the growth of the viscosities in (3.53) – (3.55), all terms proportional to either  $G_{n_x n_x}$  or  $G_{n_y n_y}$  can be dropped, and feedback from density fluctuations alone occurs.

We now discuss the experimental implications of our results. First we summarize our results in terms of the viscosity coefficients  $\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3, \nu_4, \nu_5, \gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ . The latter two viscosities as we have already indicated show no pretransitional growth, at least within the context of our theory. As noted above, the transport coefficient  $K/\gamma_1$  has been measured in supercooled nematics and only activated behavior is observed. However, we do expect that

the five viscosities  $\nu_i$  will show significant growth as the nematic is super-cooled. As they are all driven by the same density feedback mechanism we expect them to show the same power-law behavior indicated in (4.4), with eventual rounding off. At this time we cannot predict how wide the temperature regime will be where (4.4) is valid. We also expect on the basis of the results of refs. 18 and 21 where the effects of local structure on a simple fluid were considered that the shear modes of the nematic will become propagating modes at sufficiently high frequency. If the Leutheusser scenario were not ultimately invalidated by a cutoff mechanism then at the glass transition and below the shear modes would propagate at any frequency and a nonzero shear modulus would be present. Again at this time we cannot predict what the lower frequency cutoff will be; calculation of this cutoff will be sensible once the controversy regarding the rounding off of the glass transition is resolved. At that time it will also be sensible to study in detail (3.53) – (3.55) and calculate the  $\vec{k}$  and  $\omega$  dependence of the viscosities. The modes associated with the director relaxation remain diffusive. In that sense there will be an interchange of the “fast” and “slow” modes of eqns. (3.19) – (3.21), with director relaxation becoming fast and shear relaxation becoming slow.

Table I. The zeroth order matrix  $G_0^{-1}$ . The tensors  $\alpha_{ij}$  and  $L_{ij}$  are defined in eqns. (3.6) and (3.7), and  $\chi^{-1} = A + Bk^2$

|              | $\rho$                  | $P_i$                                    | $n_j$                                             | $\hat{\rho}$ | $\hat{P}_j$                               | $\hat{n}_j$                                       |
|--------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| $\rho$       | 0                       | 0                                        | 0                                                 | $-\omega$    | $\rho_o \chi^{-1} k_j$                    | 0                                                 |
| $P_i$        | 0                       | 0                                        | 0                                                 | $k_i$        | $-\omega \delta_{ij} + i L_{ij} / \rho_o$ | $-\frac{1}{\rho_o} K \alpha_{ij}$                 |
| $n_i$        | 0                       | 0                                        | 0                                                 | 0            | $-\alpha_{ij} k^2$                        | $\delta_{ij} (\omega + \frac{i K k^2}{\gamma_1})$ |
| $\hat{\rho}$ | $\omega$                | $-k_i$                                   | 0                                                 | 0            | 0                                         | 0                                                 |
| $\hat{P}_i$  | $-\rho_o \chi^{-1} k_j$ | $\omega \delta_{ij} + i L_{ij} / \rho_o$ | $\alpha_{ji} k^2$                                 | 0            | $2\beta^{-1} L_{ij}$                      | 0                                                 |
| $\hat{n}_i$  | 0                       | $\frac{1}{\rho_o K} \alpha_{ij}$         | $\delta_{ij} (\omega + \frac{i K k^2}{\gamma_1})$ | 0            | 0                                         | $2\beta^{-1} \gamma_1^{-1}$                       |

## Appendix

In this appendix we provide the technical details of our one-loop calculation of the self-energies appearing in (3.24) – (3.31).

We consider only those diagrams where the propagators are either  $G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}, \omega)$  or  $G_{nn}(\vec{k}, \omega)$  in order to search for a growth in the viscosities due to density and/or director feedback. We will ignore mixed propagators  $G_{\rho n_x}$ . As discussed by Forster, this correlation function contains both sound poles as well as  $\tilde{\Gamma}_s$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}_f$ . When expanded in terms of these poles, the strengths of the sound poles can be determined and for large viscosities yield a constant contribution, rather than the  $1/\omega$  needed for feedback. The strengths of the director poles cannot be determined to the order in  $k$  that we have worked, but it is unlikely that a  $1/\omega$  pole would emerge.

The diagrams potentially yielding feedback are all of the bubble variety formed from two three-point vertices. In equations (3.42) – (3.52) we have listed those vertices which contribute to the self-energies we need. While we have chosen the external momentum  $\vec{k}$  to lie in the  $x - y$  plane, we note that internal momenta can point in any direction.

We find the following results for the self-energies with two hatted external lines:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x \hat{P}_x} = & \int \frac{d^3 k'}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} \left\{ G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}', \omega') G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega') \right. \\
& \cdot \left[ \frac{1}{4} (A k_x + B(k'_x (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}') - k_x \vec{k}' \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')) \right) \cdot \\
& (2A k_x B(k'_x k'^2 + k_x \vec{k}' \cdot (\vec{k}' - \vec{k})) + \\
& - I^2 (k_x - k'_x)(k_z - k'_z)^2 ((k_x - k'_x)(k_z - k'_z)^2 + k'_x k'^2_z) \\
& - I^2 (\lambda + 1) \left( \frac{1}{4} (\lambda + 1) k_z^2 k'_x (k_z - k'_z) \right. \\
& + k_z (k_x - k'_x)(k_z - k'_z)^2) \cdot (k'_x (k_z - k'_z) + k'_z (k_x - k'_x)) \\
& \left. - \left( I((k_x - k'_x)(k_z - k'_z)^2 + k'_x k'^2_z) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + \frac{I}{2} (\lambda + 1) k_z (k'_x (k_z - k'_z) + k'_z (k_x - k'_x)) \right) \right) \\
& \cdot (A k_x + B(k'_x (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}') - k_x \vec{k}' \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')) \\
& \left. + G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k}', \omega') G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega') \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cdot \left\{ -K^2 k'_x (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 (k'_x (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 + k'^2 (k_x - k_x)) \right. \\
& - (2\lambda K^2 k_x + \lambda^2 K^2 k_x^2) (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 (k'^2 + (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2) \Big\} \\
& + G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k}', \omega) G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega') \\
& \cdot (-K^2 k'_x (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 (k'_x (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 + k'^2 (k_x - k_x)) \Big\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{\hat{p}_y \hat{P}_y} = & \int \frac{d^3 \vec{k}'}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} \left\{ G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}', \omega') G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega') \right. \\
& \cdot \left( -\frac{B^2}{4} k'^2 (k'_y)^2 (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}') \right. \\
& + I^2 k'_y (k_z - k'_z)^2 (k'_y (k'_z)^2 - k'_y (k_z - k'_z)^2) \\
& - I^2 (\lambda + 1) \left( \frac{1}{4} (\lambda + 1) k_z^2 k'_y (k_z - k'_z) \right. \\
& - k_z k'_y (k_z - k'_z)^2) \cdot (k'_y (k_z - k'_z) - k'_y k'_z) \\
& - (I (k'_y k_z'^2 - k'_y (k_z - k'_z)^2) \\
& + \frac{I}{2} (\lambda + 1) k_z (k'_y (k_z - k'_z) - k'_y k'_z)) \\
& \cdot B k'_y (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}') \Big) \\
& + G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k}', \omega') G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega) \\
& \cdot (-K^2 k'_y (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 (k'_y (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 - k'_y k'^2) \\
& + (G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k}', \omega) G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega') \\
& \cdot (K^2 k'_y (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 (k'_y (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 - k'_y k'^2)) \Big)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{\hat{p}_z \hat{P}_z} = & \int \frac{d^3 \vec{k}'}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} \left\{ G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}', \omega') G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega') \right. \\
& \cdot \left( \frac{1}{4} (A k_z + B (k'_z (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}') - k_z \vec{k}' \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')) \right) \\
& \cdot (2A k_z + B (k'_z k'^2 + k_z k \vec{k}' \cdot (\vec{k}' - \vec{k})) \\
& - I^2 (k_z - k'_z)^3 ((k_z - k'_z)^3 + k_z'^3) \Big)
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& -I^2(\lambda - 1)(k_z - k'_z)^3 k_x (k_z^2 - k'^2_z) \\
& -I((k_z - k'_z)^3 + k'^3_z) \\
& \cdot (Ak_z + B(k'_z(\vec{k} - \vec{k}') - k_z \vec{k}' \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')) \\
& + (G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k}', \omega) G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega') + \\
& G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k}' \omega') G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega')) \\
& \cdot (-K^2) (k'_z(\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 (k'_z(\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 \\
& + k'^2(k_z - k'_z)) + (k'^2 + (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2) \cdot \\
& (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 (\lambda^2 k_z^2 - 2\lambda k_z k'_z))
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x \hat{P}_z} = & \int \frac{d^3 \vec{k}'}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} \left\{ G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}', \omega') G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega') \right. \\
& \cdot \left( Ak_x + B(k'_x(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}') - k_x \vec{k}' \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')) \right) \\
& \cdot \left( 2Ak_z + B(k'_z k'^2 + k_z \vec{k}' \cdot (\vec{k}' - \vec{k})) \right) \\
& - \frac{I}{2} (Ak_x + B(k'_x(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}') - k_x \vec{k}' \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')) \\
& ((k_z - k'_z)^3 + k'^3_z) + (\lambda - 1) k_x k'_z (k_z - k'_z)) \\
& - I^2 (k_x - k'_x) (k_z - k'_z)^2 ((k_z - k'_z)^3 + k'^3_z) \\
& - \frac{I^2}{2} (\lambda + 1) k_z (k_z - k'_z)^3 (k'_x (k_z - k'_z) + k'_z (k_x - k'_x)) \\
& I^2 (\lambda - 1) k_z k'_z (k_x - k'_x) (k_z - k'_z)^3 \\
& - \frac{I^2}{2} (\lambda^2 - 1) k_z k_z k'_x k'_z (k_z - k'_z) \\
& - \frac{I}{2} (\lambda + 1) k_z k'_z (k_x - k'_x) \cdot \\
& (Ak_z + B(k'_z(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}') - k_z \vec{k}' \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')) \\
& + G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k}', \omega') G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega') \\
& \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 K^2 (-\frac{1}{2} (\lambda + 1) k_x (k'_z (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 + k'^2(k_z - k'_z)) \\
& - \frac{1}{2} (\lambda - 1) k_x k'_z (k'^2 + (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2))
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +\lambda^2 K^2 k_x k_z (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 (k'^2 + (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2) \\
& + (G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k}', \omega') G_{n_x n_x}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega')) \\
& + G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k}', \omega') G_{n_y n_y}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega')) \\
& \cdot (-K^2) (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 k'_x \\
& (k'_z (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 + k'^2 (k_z - k'_z)) \\
& + k_z k'^2 + (\vec{k} - \vec{k}')^2 k_z)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{\hat{n}_x \hat{n}_x} = & \int \frac{d^3 \vec{k}'}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} \left\{ G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k}', \omega') G_{\rho\rho}(\vec{k} - \vec{k}', \omega - \omega') \right. \\
& \cdot \left( \frac{I}{\gamma_1} \right)^2 k'_x (k_z - k'_z) (k'_x (k'_z - k_z) + k'_z (k'_x - k_x))
\end{aligned}$$

The remaining self-energies needed,  $\Sigma_{n_x \hat{n}_x}$ ,  $\Sigma_{\hat{n}_y P_y}$  and  $\Sigma_{\hat{P}_x \rho}$ , do not exhibit feedback. The first of these renormalize the Frank constants and has no graphs of the form we are considering. However, the finite graph contributing to  $\Sigma_{n_x \hat{n}_x}$  does break the one-constant approximation. Similarly, the other two self-energies also do not have any graphical contributions of the form we are considering.

With the self-energies (A1) – (A5) the viscosities  $\nu_i, i = 1, \dots, 5$  can principle be calculated to one-loop order using (3.32) – (3.36). In general these expressions are quite complicated and not much will be learned by displaying them. Even the hydrodynamic limit is difficult to evaluate (except for  $\nu_2$  and  $\nu_3$ ) due to the anisotropy of the propagators. Finally the functions  $f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3, g_0, g_1, g_2, h_1$  and  $h_2$  appearing in (3.53) – (3.55) can in principle be calculated using (3.37) – (3.39) and (A1) – (A5).

## References

\* Present address: Spectral Sciences, Inc., 99 S. Bedford St., Burlington, MA 08103

1. For experimental studies of a nematic glass, see e.g. J. I. Spielberg and E. Gelerinter, Phys. Rev. A. **32**, 3647 (1985), H. R. Zeller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 334 (1982), and W. J. Laprice and D. L. Uhrich, J. Chem. Phys. **71**, 1498 (1979).
2. M. Gabay and G. Toulouse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 201 (1981).
3. For a theoretical study for an anisotropic glassy system see e.g. L. Golubovic and T. C. Lubensky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1082 (1989).
4. E. Leutheusser, Phys. Rev. A **29**, 2765 (1984). For a review see W. Götze, in “Liquids, Freezing and Glass Transitions”, J. P. Hansen, D. Levesque and J. Zinn-Justin, eds. North-Holland, New York, 1991.
5. S. Das, G. Mazenko, S. Ramaswamy and J. Toner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 118 (1985). For a review see B. Kim and G. F. Mazenko, Advances in Chemical Physics, **78**, 129 (1990).
6. S. Das and G. Mazenko, Phys. Rev. A **34**, 2265 (1986).
7. R. Schmitz, J. W. Dufty and P. De, unpublished.
8. See the review articles cited in refs. 4 and 5.
9. B. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 1991 (1991).
10. See e.g. Y. Y. Goldschmidt in “Recent Progress in Random Magnets”, D. H. Ryan, ed., World Scientific Singapore, 1992.
11. For an introduction to liquid crystals, see, e.g., P.G. de Gennes, “The Physics of Liquid Crystals”, Clarendon, Oxford, 1974.
12. See refs. 11, 12, and 16, as well as M. J. Stephen and J. P. Straley, Rev. Mod. Phys. **46**, 617 (1974), D. Forster, T. C. Lubensky, P. C. Martin, J. Swift and P. S. Pershan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26**, 1016 (1971), F. Jähnig and H. Schmidt, Ann. Phys. **71**, 129 (1972).

13. P. C. Martin, O. Parodi and P. S. Pershan, Phys. Rev. A. **6**, 2401 (1972).
14. S. Ma and G. F. Mazenko, Phys. Rev. B **11**, 4077 (1975).
15. We have found that the nonlinearities in  $\delta n_i$  do not yield a feedback mechanism and in the interest of simplicity we will ignore them from the start.
16. D. Forster, Annals. of Phys. **85**, 505 (1974) and “Hydrodynamic Fluctuations, Broken Symmetry and Correlation Functions”, W. A. Benjamin, (1975).
17. D. Foster, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 1161 (1974).
18. S. Das, Phys. Rev. A **36**, 211 (1987).
19. P. C. Martin, E. D. Siggia and H. A. Rose, Phys. Rev. A. **8**, 423 (1973).
20. S. D. Goren, C. Korn and S. B. Marks, Phys. Rev. Lett. **34**, 1212 (1975); J. W. Doane, C. E. Tarr and M. A. Nickerson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 620 (1974); S. Meiboom and R. C. Hewitt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 261 (1973).
21. S. Das, Phys. Rev. A. **42**, 6116 (1990).